Applicant : Chavez et al.
Serial No. : 10/719,560
Filed : November 21, 2003
Page : 7 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-149001 / 2003P00700 US

REMARKS

In the outstanding non-final office action, claims 11-21 and 25-33 were rejected. Applicants have amended claims 11 and 25 to address a typographical error. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration in view of the comments below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103: CLAIMS 11-21 AND 25-33

Claims 11-21 and 25-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,826,745 to Coker et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,372 to Barnes et al. Claims 11 and 25 are independent. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims define subject matter that is patentable over the prior art of record. For example, independent claims 11 and 25 recite, among other things, providing a translation creation graphical user interface that comprises a first screen area in which is displayed at least a part of the script in the first language. The first screen area includes multiple distinct script areas, within each of which is displayed a different one of the distinct script portions of the script from at least two of the script nodes. The translation creation graphical user interface further comprises a second screen area that serves as a work area in which a translation of the call center application script in a second language is displayed. The second screen area includes multiple distinct script areas that are each associated with one of the script areas of the first screen area. Each script area provides an area within which is provided a translation in the second language of the script portion displayed in the associated script area of the first screen area.

The claimed subject matter can facilitate the script translation process. For example, the recited translation creation graphical user interface can allow a user to view all of the script elements in a particular viewing area. Specification, ¶ 9. By displaying all of the script elements in the viewing area, a script designer may be less likely to forget to translate any of the script elements into the new language. *Id.*

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed translation creation graphical user interface, nor do the references contemplate the

advantages provided by the claimed interface. For example, neither Coker nor Barnes,

separately or in combination, teaches or suggests a method that provides a "first screen area

[that] includes multiple distinct script areas within each of which is displayed a different one of

the distinct script portions of the script from at least two of the script nodes, " as recited in

Applicants' independent claims. The office action admits that Coker does not explicitly disclose

"the exact layout of . . . 'translation creation graphical user interface.'" Office action mailed

June 6, 2008, pg. 4. However, the office action asserts that Coker's discussion of a basic

administration view and a view used to enter questions, answers, and their respective translations

"sufficiently discloses" the claimed translation creation graphical user interface.

  Contrary to the assertions in the office action, Coker does not disclose or suggest the

claimed translation creation graphical user interface. Even assuming that Coker suggests first

and second screen areas (which Applicants do not concede), Coker's mention of a view "used to

enter questions and their translations and their answers and translations" does not teach or

suggest the layout of the first and second screen areas recited in Applicants' claims. For

example, Coker is silent regarding a "first screen area [that] includes multiple distinct script

areas within each of which is displayed a different one of the distinct script portions of the script

from at least two of the script nodes."

  Like Coker, Barnes fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the recited "first screen area

[that] includes multiple distinct script areas within each of which is displayed a different one of

the distinct script portions of the script from at least two of the script nodes." Nowhere does

Barnes disclose or suggest displaying distinct script portions of the script from at least two of the

script nodes. Indeed, as the following portion of the rejection illustrates, the office action

notably does not assert that Barnes discloses this limitation:

> Barnes discloses . . . *a first screen area in which is displayed at least a part of a*
> *text in a first language, wherein the first screen area includes multiple distinct*
> *text areas within each of which is displayed a different one of distinct text*
> *portions of the text* (Fig. 19, area 292)

Office Action mailed June 6, 2008, pg. 4 (emphasis in original). As such, neither Coker nor Barnes, taken separately or in combination, suggests "display[ing] . . . distinct script portions of the script from at least two of the script nodes."

Moreover, neither Coker nor Barnes, either together or separately, contemplates the advantages provided by the claimed subject matter. As described in the Background section of Applicants' specification, prior art tools may require script designers to translate text for a first script element in a first translation step (or window) and then translate the text for the remaining script elements in steps. Specification, ¶ 6. This type of multi-step translation process can add extra overhead and increase the possibility that a script designer may inadvertently forget to translate the text associated with a particular script element. *Id.* By displaying script portions from multiple different nodes in the same translation tool, the claimed translation graphical user interface can minimize this disadvantage of prior systems. *Id.* The cited references do not teach or suggest a translation tool that provides such an advantage.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 11 and 25 be withdrawn, as well as the rejection of pending dependent claims 12-21 and 26-33.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants submit that claims 11-21 and 25-33 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Chavez et al.
Serial No. : 10/719,560
Filed : November 21, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-149001 / 2003P00700 US

Please apply $130 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____10/6/2008_____

Linzy T. McCartney
Reg. No. 61,886

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

60506947.doc